

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

ESHA RESEARCH, INC.,
now known as TRUSTWELL

Plaintiff,

v.

CRONOMETER SOFTWARE, INC.,
formerly known as BIGCRUNCH CONSULTING, LTD.,
and DOES 1-20.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:24-cv-01586-AB

ORDER

BAGGIO, District Judge:

The Court has reviewed the parties' Stipulated Protective Order (ECF 14). The Court, however, is unable to enter the Order without the following modifications.

Page 2, ¶ 2:	Delete "and trial testimony" from the first sentence. Following the second sentence, insert <This Protective Order also does not govern the use of protected material at trial. Any use of this material at trial shall be governed by the orders of the Court.>
Page 4, ¶ 4	In the next-to-last sentence insert <from the date that the request for unsealing is filed> between <days> and <motion>
Page 5, ¶ 7 f.	Because this protective order can only bind the parties, the Court is uncertain what is contemplated by <The authors and the original recipients of the documents.> Is this a reference to the parties' communications and or briefing related to this case? And if not, please explain further.
Page 6, ¶ 10	Insert <move to> between <may> and <exclude.>

Page 6, ¶ 11	Replace <a party may file an appropriate motion before the Court requesting that the Court determine whether the Protective Order covers the document in dispute.> with <As discussed at the Rule 16 Conference, the parties will send an email to the Court's Courtroom Deputy with a one-page letter attached that details each parties' position. The Court will then determine if a motion is needed.>
Page 6, ¶ 11	Replace <by order of the Court.> with <by the Court, either informally or with an order.>

Accordingly, the Court DENIES the parties' Stipulated Motion for a Protective Order but invites the parties to file a renewed Motion that incorporates the above modifications.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 13th day of February 2025.


 AMY M. BAGGIO
 United States District Judge